## BEST AVAILABLE COPY .



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

				10
SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/403,55	7 10/25/ <del>9</del> 9	BERGER		BERGER
				EXAMINER
		IM22/1031	<b>5</b> Δ 16	SURU,U
COLLARD & ROE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1077 NORT ROSLYN NY	HERN BOULEVAR / 11576	RD .	171	12
		DA	ATE MAILED:	

10/31/01

## Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

		ADVISORY ACTION
Xi	TH	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:
a) 1	X	is extended to run or continues to run from the date of the final rejection
b)		expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
		Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
	•	pellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).  (further hold)  plicant's response to the final rejection, filed Oct 09, 2001 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed
X	Ap to	plicant's response to the final rejection, filed Oct 09,200 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed place the application in condition for allowance:
1.		The proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
		<ul> <li>a.          There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.     </li> </ul>
		b. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
		c. They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
		d. They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
		e.   They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
		NOTE: <u>see note affached</u>
2. [		Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. [		Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment $\square$ will be entered $\square$ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:
		Claims allowed:
		Claims objected to:
		Claims rejected:
		Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. 7	ব্	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because
		of reasons stated in note attached.
5. [		The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficent reasons why it was not earlier presented.
T	The	proposed drawing correction  has  has not been approved by the examiner.
Æ,	Oth	PTO-1449 (paper no 11)

-PTOL-303 (REV. 6-89)

\*U.S. GPO: 1997-417-381/62704

Application/Control Number: 90/403,557

Art Unit: 1711

## NOTE ATTACHED TO ADVISORY ACTION

Applicants argue (page 12, paragraph 2, Paper No. 10) that organosilicate is not disclosed by Ritter who discloses a filler. This is not persuasive because Ritter (page 22, claim 1, of English translation) teaches (claimed) alkali-silicate (water glass).

It is examiner's position that instant claims are obvious Ritter in view of Maruhashi.

Newly amended claims 18-20 and 25-30 are also rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to convey what precisely falls within their scope. They appear to be translations of a foreign language, not conforming to current US practice.

U.K. Rajguru/dh

October 19, 2001

Superior of the second of the